



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,376	01/07/2002	Lars Persson	003300-885	5556

7590 06/23/2005

BENTON S. DUFFETT, JR.
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

LUK, EMMANUEL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1722

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/036,376	Applicant(s) PERSSON, LARS	
	Examiner Emmanuel S. Luk	Art Unit 1722	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rees (3482284) in view of Asai (5297951) in view of Travaglini (5731014).

Rees teaches an injection mold comprising ejectors (50") in the mold halves (48") that are adapted to eject a component, the ejectors are received in ducts (51"), press pin (54) that apply force to the ejectors, the duct extends from a cavity arranged in the mold and through the plates (14, 25, 32b), the duct accommodate resetting means consisting of springs (53), each ejector facing the component forms part of the boundary surface of the cavity (Fig. 1). The press pin being concentrically arranged with the duct in the locking late and the mould half (Fig. 1).

Rees fails to teach a pressure plate a pressure plate having the press pins and modules.

Asai teaches an injection mold comprising ejectors (7,6) in the mold halves (2) that are adapted to eject a component, the ejectors are received in ducts (Fig. 1), press pins (9A, 9B) that apply force to the ejectors, the duct extends from a cavity arranged in the mold and through the locking plates (25), the ducts accommodate resetting means consisting of springs (8A,8B), each ejector facing the component forms part of the boundary surface of the cavity (Fig. 1), the ejectors having a profile that would prevent rotations (Fig. 1). The ducts extend from the cavity to the locking plate (Fig. 1) as seen by the openings in the locking plate (25) where the pins (9A, 9B) can pass through the locking plate. In regards to the modules, one of ordinary skill in the art can see in Asai that the components comprise of modules. The cavity is located in the mold module comprising of plates (1, 2, and 11), the ejector module are the plates that contain the ejectors and resetting means (8A,8B), the locking plate comprises of another module that are bolted into place (Fig. 1).

Travaglini teaches a modular injection molding assembly having a plate (23) having pins (25; rods) that engages the ejectors (32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rees with the modules as taught by Asai because it allows for easy assembly and maintenance and a pressure plate that moves the press pins into actuating the ejectors as taught by Travaglini because it allows for the actuation of multiple pins from one actuating device.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/30/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In light of the amendment, a new search was made focusing on the concentric arrangement of the ducts and press pins. The new prior art reference, Rees, teaches the use of press pins in relation to the ejector and the ejector having a duct that receives the press pins, the duct also containing the resetting means and all the elements are in concentric arrangement with the press pins. A new rejection has been made in light of Rees.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hultgren (2994921).


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel S. Luk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8 to 5 and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Davis can be reached on (571) 272-1129. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EL



ROBERT DAVIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300 / 200

6/22/05